

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated March 27, 2007 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Paragraph [0023] of the specification has been amended to correct a grammatical error.

Claim 1 is hereby amended. No claims have been canceled. Claims 8-23 are hereby added. Accordingly, claims 1-23 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,960,139 to *Rizzetto* (hereinafter “*Rizzetto*”). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As required in Chapter 2131 of the MPEP, in order to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, “the reference must teach each and every element of the claim.” The Applicant respectfully submits that *Rizzetto* does not teach every element recited in claim 1 and therefore cannot anticipate the claim.

More specifically, claim 1 recites a washing machine which includes, among other features, “a first water supply valve for supplying water . . . and a second water supply valve for supplying water, wherein said second water supply valve is configured for introducing the bleaching agent and the fabric softener to a tub.”

The Office Action alleges that *Rizzetto* discloses a first water supply used to introduce detergent and a second water supply valve used to introduce the bleaching agent or the fabric softener in common to a tub. The Office relies upon col. 2:63-68 to teach these features. *See paragraph 3 of the Office Action.* The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

First, it is noted that the disclosure of *Rizzetto* contained in col. 2 lines 63-68, which the Examiner uses as the basis for the rejection, refers to modifications to a prior French patent such that a washing machine would be able to take in both hot and cold water in the same cycle. *Rizzetto col. 2 lines 53-57*. This portion of the disclosure does not teach or suggest one valve for controlling detergent and a separate valve for controlling both bleach and fabric softener. *Rizzetto* does not even teach valves associated with the individual reservoirs. In contrast, *Rizzetto* teaches a single rotary disk (i.e. a “distributor”) that is capable of distributing water to only one reservoir at a time. *Rizzetto col. 5:50 - col. 5:8*. The valves described, albeit briefly, in *Rizzetto* are common to all of the reservoirs, as they are associated with the hot and cold water lines and not the reservoirs. *Id. at col. 4:39-44*. *Rizzetto* does not have valves as described in the invention. Therefore, *Rizzetto* fails to teach or suggest all of the features of claim 1.

For at least the aforementioned reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over *Rizzetto* and respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Office rejected claims 2-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Rizzetto*. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

As required in Chapter 2143.03 of the MPEP, in order to “establish *prima facie* obviousness of the claimed invention, all the limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art.” The Applicant submits that *Rizzetto* does not teach or suggest each and every element recited in claims 2-7.

As previously discussed *Rizzetto* does not disclose all of the features recited in claim 1, the base claim from which claims 2-7 depend. Thus, *Rizzetto* can not render claims 2-7 obvious. Accordingly, claims 2-7 are patentably distinguishable over *Rizzetto* and the Applicant requests the rejection be withdrawn.

The application is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: June 26, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By Michael L. August (Reg. No. 46,522)
for Mark R. Kresloff
Registration No.: 42,766
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant